REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8 are amended. Claims 2 and 9 are cancelled without prejudice. Claim 1 is added. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 8, and 10 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application No. 2001/0034689 A1 to Heilman (hereinafter "Heilman").

Independent claim 1 is amended herewith to clarify the claimed subject matter. No new matter is added the amendments being fully supported by the originally filed specification, for example, FIGS. 1, 5 and 6 (see in particular S11) with their corresponding descriptions.

Independent claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Heilman at least by reciting "said control unit requests an approval operation by the receiver for each of the information items, and, when the approval operation is not performed, restricts the provider to input next information items to the first window." Claims 4-6 depending from independent claim 1 are patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from independent claim 1.

Claim 2 is amended and rewritten in independent form herewith. Claim 2 amendments are fully supported by the originally filed specification, for example, FIGS. 1, 7 and 8 (see in particular S31) with their corresponding descriptions. Claim 2 patentably distinguishes over Heilman at least by reciting "said control unit requests an approval operation by the provider for each of the information items , and, when the approval operation is not performed, restricts the receiver to input next information items to the second operation terminal."

Independent claim 7 is amended herewith to clarify the claimed subject matter. No new matter is added and the amendments are fully supported by the originally filed specification, for example, FIGS. 5 and 6 (see in particular S11) with their corresponding descriptions. Claim 7 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art at least by reciting that "an approval operation by the receiver is requested for each of the information items, and, when the approval operation is not performed, restricts the provider from inputting next information items to the first window."

Independent claim 8 is amended herewith to clarify the claimed subject matter. No new matter is added the amendments being fully supported by the originally filed specification, for example, FIGS. 7 and 8 (see in particular S31) with their corresponding descriptions. Claim 8 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art at least by reciting:

- when the information items are input by the receiver to the second window, an approval operation by the provider is requested for each of the information items,
- when the approval operation is not performed, the receiver is restricted from inputting next information items to the second window, and
- the next information items which are input in the second window are displayed into the first window on the first operation terminal when the approval operation is performed.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Heilman in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0027901 A1 to Liu (hereinafter "Liu").

Liu does not correct or compensate for the above identified failure of Heilman in anticipating all the features of claim 1 from which claim 4 depends. Thus, claim 4 is patentable at least by inheriting patentable features from claim 1.

NEW CLAIM 10

New claim 10 is directed to a remote negotiation method between a service provider and a service receiver. The claim is fully supported by the originally filed specification, for example FIGS 5-8 and their descriptions. Claim 10 is patentable at least by reciting that "a new term is input after a current term input by one of the service provider and the service receiver is approved by the other one of the service provider the service receiver," and "all the terms are displayed on the first and the second terminal for a final approval by both the service provider and the service receiver to conclude the commercial transaction."

CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Dec. 26, 2007 By: LTodor

Luminita A. Todor
Registration No. 57,639

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501